

**Steering Committee Minutes
January 24, 2004**

Steering Committee Members

David Waitley	Alpine
Margarette Morgan	Bonsall
Larry Johnson	Campo/Lake Morena
Tim McMaster	Crest / Dehesa/ H.C.
Jim Russell	Fallbrook
Shirley J. Fisher	Jacumba
Dan Neirinckx	Jamul/ Dulzura
Gene Helsle	Julian
Rick Smith	Lakeside
Gil Jemmot	Twin Oaks
Terry Glanden	Pine Valley
Joe Chisholm	Pala-Pauma
Gordon Hammers	Potrero
Sam Mitchell	Ramona
Lois Jones	San Dieguito
Jack Phillips	Valle de Oro
Sandy Smith	Valley Center

Planning Commissioner

Bryan Woods

Staff

Tom Harron
Ivan Holler
Rosemary Rowan
LeAnn Carmichael
Bob Citrano
Larry Hofreiter
Karissa Selvester
Nick Martinez

Public

Dutch VanDierendonck
Jan VanDierendonck
Iris Mitchell
Mark Turney
C.T. Davis
Lael Montgomery
Rich Randolph
Larry Glavinic
John Stewart
Carol Anus
Julie Bugbee
Sandra Famell

Meeting commenced at approximately 9:10 a.m.

INTRODUCTIONS

Woods: Review minutes from November 23rd and April 26th 2003 meetings and ask if there are any corrections and/or revisions.

Phillips: We never got the Nov. 23rd minutes.

Woods: Lets table that and have staff redistribute new copies of those minutes. Did everyone receive his or her April 26th copies? ... Any comments?

Phillips: Clarification on what I said... I did not say (page 12), "We should insert densities that exceed parcel based subdivisions, guidelines, or increases in..." I would like that noted.

Woods: So noted. Are there any other corrections? If not, I'd like to entertain a motion.

Glavinic: Motion

Jones: Second

Motion carries as corrected.

Woods: This morning our agenda is Conservation Subdivisions, which includes a discussion on the Interest Group proposal. This follows previous meetings of the Steering Committee. Conservation Subdivisions are based on the concepts presented in the Randal Arendt video that this group viewed last year.. We would like you to consider how you would like to craft your own Steering Committee proposal. The format that we would like to follow is as such: 1) present the Interest Group proposal; 2) break into three groups to have all of you discuss the proposal amongst yourselves and develop concepts for a Steering Committee proposal; 3) return to the larger group and present your ideas (no vote at this time); 4) take the information back to your community groups for analysis and discussion; 5) finally, come back to a subsequent SC meeting prepared to take a position on this issue.

Ivan: Bob Citrano will make the Staff presentation, which consists of an overview of the IG proposal. This is not an IG creation, as it is more a Randal Arendt concept. It also draws from other planning efforts in other parts of the country and California, where these Conservation Subdivisions have been utilized. We will then have an opportunity for questions and answers before we continue with the smaller group discussions. And with that, I'd like to introduce Bob Citrano...

Citrano: Did everyone receive a copy of the handout so that you can follow along with the presentation?

First of all, we'd like to give a brief definition of a conservation subdivision. Randal Arendt described a conservation subdivision as a golf course community without the golf course. Basically, it is a way of grouping smaller lots together to leave a portion of the original lot as open space.

The next slide shows examples: 1) top slide shows raw land; 2) bottom left slide shows typical subdivision – entire area parceled out with parcels large enough to take up the entire original site; 3) bottom right slide shows a Conservation Subdivision, with homes grouped around a common open space, with remaining portions of the parcel that have been left with their original setting.

The major objectives of a Conservation Subdivision are: to preserve and protect the sensitive environmental resources, to preserve the agricultural lands and native vegetation areas, to increase the defensibility against fires, to reduce infrastructure costs by reducing the development footprint), and to provide communities with facilities for recreation.

In the IG proposal, there are five key components: minimum lot size, minimum open space requirement, maximum footprint (portion of the lot disturbed by

development), remainder parcels, density incentives, and mandatory vs. voluntary categories. (In one acre there are 43,560 square feet.)

The picture on the screen (please excuse the quality) helps to give an example of what a 5,000 sq.ft. lot might look like. Now, let's look at how the IG proposal would apply to the SR-1 density category (refer to presentation handout):

SR-1 (using a 5,000 sq ft. minimum lot)

- A 20-acre parcel would yield 20 lots
- 25% (5 acres) preserved in open space
- 30% of development footprint set aside for infrastructure
- 12-acre remainder area left over

SR-1 (sizing lots so there is no remainder)

- 25% preserved open space
- 6/10 acre lot

Phillips: I scaled that photograph, and that is not a 5,000 square foot lot. It isn't even close.

Citrano: Well, it's an approximation. We are trying to show what a 50-foot wide lot would look like.

Phillips: The white residence is more than 50-feet wide and there is 20-feet between buildings. We are talking about putting something in our Estate Residential areas and I'm telling you that you are not representing what a 5,000 square foot lot looks like, photographically. Now, maybe your semi-scaled drawing shows it, but this photograph is a misrepresentation.

Woods: Jack, it is not a gross misrepresentation.

Holler: Jack, this is actually in the 4-S Ranch area and it is close to 5,000 square foot lot and I would doubt that there is actually 20-feet between those two houses (the side yard set back is probably less than that). The only point of this is to show what a small lot development might look like. We are trying to show each side of the continuum and what can be achieved in terms of the development footprint. It is just an attempt to show both sides of the spectrum.

Phillips: Well then show it more accurately, because you are talking about putting this in estate residential.

Holler: Right now we are just showing you what it might look like. This is not an advocacy position.

***Point of clarification:** From additional research, brought up by Jack Phillips question/concern, it was discovered that the lots shown in the picture were actually 4,000 square feet and 6,000 square feet respectively, resulting in an average of 5,000 square foot lots for the area.*

Citrano: Now, let's look at our second scenario (under the interest group proposal):

SR-2 (using a minimum lot size of 5,000 sq ft.)

- A 20-acre parcel would yield 10 lots

- 40% (8 acres) preserved in open space
- 1 ½ acres of development footprint set aside for infrastructure
- 10 ½ acres remainder area left over

SR-2 (lots sized to have no remainder)

- A 20-acre parcel would yield 10 lots
- 40% (8 acres) preserved open space
- 12-acre development footprint
- 1-acre lots

Committee Member: Just a point of clarification... what do they propose is mandatory versus voluntary?

Citrano: Under the IG proposal, SR1 – SR4 would be voluntary and SR-10 and lower would be mandatory.

Committee Member: What kind of activities can take place in the required open space?

Woods: If everyone could remember, this is the IG proposal... you don't have to adopt or even support what is on the table. We just want you to understand what they came up with.

Citrano: OK...to answer your question, potential uses for the open space include: passive recreation, non-motorized trails, native plant and resource protection, areas for project mitigation, MSCP, agriculture, wells, storage facilities. However, if there is a remainder area, then some of these uses could also be located there.

Now, here is the next scenario:

SR-4 (using a minimum lot of 10,000 sq ft.)

- A 20-acre parcel would yield 5 lots
- 60% (12 acres) preserved in open space
- 1½ acres of development footprint set aside for infrastructure
- 6 ½ acres remainder area left over

SR-4 (lots sized without a remainder)

- A 20-acre parcel would yield 5 lots
- 60% (12 acres) preserved open space
- 8-acre development footprint
- 1 ¼ -acre lots (55,800 sq ft.)

SR-10 (minimum lot size of 10,000 sq ft.)

- A 20-acre parcel would yield 2 lots
- 75% (15 acres) preserved in open space
- 1½ acres of development footprint set aside for infrastructure
- 4 ½ acres remainder area left over

SR-10 (lot sized without a remainder)

- A 20-acre parcel would yield 2 lots
- 40% (8 acres) preserved open space

- After accounting for infrastructure results in lots slightly larger than two acres

Morgan: On one of the boards you just had up, you had a fire buffer shown. Can you go into some detail on that? I deal with three different fire departments and they have all decided that they want a minimum of a 200-ft fire buffer. So, if we are looking at this other concept of the no remainder ...

Citrano: What we are trying to show is that the fire buffer can not be accommodated on the minimum lots proposed by the IG -. When we look at the larger lots, some of the fire buffer can be accommodated on the lot, but probably not all of it. So, in some cases the fire buffer will have to be in the required open space. Here [with the minimum parcel sizes] the buffer extends into the remainder area. So, we know that the minimum lot size is not going to accommodate the fire buffer, and some of the larger lots will be better at that. In these examples, we have a 150 ft. buffer.

RL-20 (using a minimum lot size of 15,000 sq ft.)

- A 20-acre parcel would yield 1 lot
- 82.5% (16.5 acres) preserved in open space
- 3 acres remainder area left over

RL-20 (lots sized without a remainder)

- A 20-acre parcel would yield 1 lot
- 82.5% (16.5 acres) preserved open space
- Little over 3-acre lots

Morgan: Given that I am a more rural community, as compared with some others, I'd like to know where we are going to accommodate our agriculture.

Citrano: Well, that has been identified as an acceptable use within the open space.

Morgan: Does that include horses also?

Holler: That may be something that this group might want to address more directly.

Morgan: Ok...because this wouldn't quite massage into our community plan very well.

Hammers: What are the options for putting leech lines into that area [open space]?

Citrano: The IG did allow that in certain categories, and that is something that this group can certainly explore.

Ok...I think you guys understand the basic idea. In your handout there are diagrams for the IG proposal in RL-40, 80, and 160 density categories - I didn't make boards for these.

The IG also identified the maximum footprint as one of the IG's primary concerns. They focused on minimizing the portion of the site disturbed by development. Current County regulations state if you disturb more than five acres, you need to go through CEQA. Therefore, for the density categories SR-10 and RL-20, the IG set a maximum footprint of 2 acres. For the rural lands, RL-40-160, the maximum footprint was set at 5 acres.

Committee Member: Is that regardless of the size of the parcel?

Holler: Right now, under County grading and clearing ordinances, the maximum that you can clear for a lot that has a house on it is five acres, and that is processed administratively. If one wants to clear beyond the five acres, a separate permit is required and is subject CEQA.

Citrano: Now, this is five acres per lot. So if you have 1,000 acres and can make 20 lots, then each of those 20 lots can have five acres cleared.

Committee Member: So you are saying the maximum footprint is per lot, not for the entire development... I need some clarification here.

Holler: In this proposal, they are talking about the maximum footprint on a lot.

Carmichael: We can define and clarify that.

Citrano: It's per lot.
Some of the things that the IG considers in the development footprint include: community amenities, driveways (internal circulation roads), brush clearing, and septic systems. All of these would be considered a part of the maximum footprint

Morgan: In the example behind you [RL-20] what is the maximum footprint for the septic system?

Citrano: Well in this case, you probably would not be able to do 1/3 of an acre lots.

Committee Member: You are looking at 300-400 feet of leech lines.

Citrano: So maybe this isn't a feasible lot size.

Committee Member: In lots that big, you are required to have sewer, but its impossible to get the density out there to justify it.

Citrano: Well, then you have to have leech fields...and when you start talking about leech fields that's where the five acres development footprints come in.

Morgan: So that would go over either into the remainder or into the open space?

Citrano: That's correct.

Woods: Which we already stated was acceptable.

Citrano: Next I'd like to discuss the Open Space Requirements identified by the IG. Open Space Requirements (from 25% to 90%) are intended to protect sensitive environmental resources; increase incrementally; are permanently protected; and allowable uses include (mentioned earlier): passive recreation, non-motorized trails, MSCP, agriculture, etc.

Hammers: When you say “permanently protected”, I’d like to know by whom, and what the enforcement procedure would be. I assume that the property owner is going to own that 85% of open space.

Citrano: Not necessarily. It could be turned over to a conservancy — here are a lot of options. The important thing is that it would be required to be permanently protected. Now, exactly how that works is not a level of detail that we are going into today.

Hammers: But that is an important detail.

Citrano: It is an important detail.

Hammers: Because, if you start putting your leech lines on a conservancy piece of property then you are going to have problems.

Russell: I think what you are saying here is misrepresented in this handout (page 14). It says that the only time you can go into the remainder parcel is if you have a common leech field (with several of the lots together). That is the only time in this document that I read that one could put a leech field into the remainder area.

Citrano: Are you talking about the section on requirements for sewer service?

Russell: Yes.

Citrano: Ok...we are not really talking about the IG proposal on this section.

Committee Member: When it identifies that you can extend leech fields out, it does not give any provisions for doing so for a single parcel.

Woods: And by the way, that is their [IG] proposal. So we have room here to talk about things like that.

Margarette: My question is regarding the open space. We currently have (within the last three months) three developers who have encroached on their open space – grading without consideration; one received an administrative permit to extend utility lines across the open space; and the third is trying to do lot area averaging and change the open space that was already dedicated on the final map. Now what we are finding is that open space means nothing. We have three examples...one right after the other where open space is not being upheld. How can we be assured that the 82% (or what have you) is ever going to be upheld?

Holler: Part of the difficulty that we have today is that the open space requirement is typically proposed as easements along the back of all the parcels (the open space is contained still on that lot). We frequently find difficulty (especially when that lot sells) with a homeowner not understanding that even though they own that area, that it is actually set aside in some sort of permanent, biological open space.

So there is frequent violation because of that. One of the differences here is that the open space would actually be a separate lot – where you have a property line boundary instead of just an easement. Lot lines are easier for folks to understand, and it ties up that open space area. However, the open space is then permanently protected via a conservation easement, deed restriction, etc. So that is a distinction that will help to resolve a lot of those encroachment issues – because your concerns are valid and they happen all the time.

Morgan: Who pays the taxes on the open space?

Holler: Who ever would own it.

Morgan: OK, but if it is an extra lot, then...

Holler: But it can still be under the same ownership.

Morgan: If that open space is under the County because it is deeded to the County, then...?

Holler: I don't know exactly how the title might be held on that lot.

Morgan: OK, my concern is that if we are looking for a tax revenue base, and we are leaving open space sitting out there deeding to the county, does that lead to a lot of hop-scotching around?

Holler: Assuming that it was deeded to the County, the County would only take something like that if it were part of a continued connectivity. The County would not take it without those circumstances. So the whole intent here is to provide open space areas that do provide some connectivity and that would function better than open space that is provided in that pattern you just described.

Hammers: I'm particularly interested in this because, in my community, we don't have small lots. Now, all new lots are going to be 10-acres and above. If I'm going to show this to my community I have to understand it, so if you can please bear with me. Now, you don't have a 40-acre lot if you don't own a 40-acre lot. So if part of it goes to the county or to some conservancy, then that is smoke and mirrors. Lets face it. You either own 40-acres or you don't. You don't own 10-acres with only the right to use 40% under certain circumstances.

Citrano: Let me clarify something. This is only a graphic representation – this probably wouldn't normally happen on a lot of this scale, but it helps to see a representation of what it would look like on a larger scale. This would really come into play on (for example) 200-acre lots where you can get 10 parcels.

Hammer: I think that the utilities that you have listed here have to be clarified, because there seems to be some gray area here. I think that you have to provide for easements because you don't know what is going to happen in the future – so if a property owner owns a 20-acre lot and the owner next door wants to do something, then he needs to be able to accommodate an easement for his neighbor to bring in a power line, a road, etc. Those type of easements need to

be provided for. What I see here in the broad brush strokes, I'm comfortable with, but the devil is in the details.

Woods: Well I think that the distinguishing issue is that this is only triggered when going through the subdivision process. If you have an established parcel of 10 acres, then you are only going back to see whether you are subject to CEQA or not to decide on your footprint.

Hammers: We have a number of lots in Potrero that are 200-acres, 400-acres, 800-acres and the owners at some point go to subdivide and someone got killed because of this thing. My concern is that, someday, the community is going to be faced with this situation and I don't want to see it happen (in however long) is for someone to come in here and put in a big subdivision. I would much rather see someone do something rational in an RL-20 that makes sense, so that that property can't be a big subdivision with higher density in the future – with someone bringing in water and sewer, etc.

Woods: But that is conservation easements, deed restrictions... we have tools.

Hammers: This year.

Woods: Well those are the best tools we have.

Hammers: Yes. I want to do something that makes sense to make that property sellable, in a fashion that will protect my community in the future.

Holler: Well I hope that you will make those comments again when some of the backcountry communities get together – when they will be most germane.

Hammers: We have to have provisions for easements and such coming across.

Woods: Ok, Larry...

Galavinic: We keeping talking about "permanent", but I'd like someone to define it in such a way that indicates perpetuity. My concern is that 20 or 40 years from now, someone is going change this thing all over the map. I'd like that to be defined up front – so we can be assured.

Harron: We can do a lot of things to protect the ongoing efficacy of these proposals. And even if you were to divide it into 20-acre lots and give each one to a different property owner, there is no guarantee that that is permanent because a future rezoning could make 10-acre lots the minimum. So, what you want to do if you want to protect the permanency is to do it through deed restrictions. The question is, who holds those interests to the conservation easement. Some people expressed a concern that if the County owns it and then changes the philosophy, then there would be development in the future. So it might be that we want to go a step further and have that right to protect it deeded not only to the County, but to others as well (maybe to surrounding property owners, developers, environmental protection group). There are many things that you can do with your deed restrictions to give you a high level of assurance that it will continue on into the future.

Woods: Ok...we will take two more quick comments because we want to finish the presentation and then break into groups.

Mitchell: We have a good example in Ramona of open space that has not been properly enforced by the county ... Ryland Homes. With approximately 20 lots or more, the open space has been encroached into, there has been no enforcement, and now (of course) the next move is to vacate the open space. Now what is going to guarantee us in the future that this is not going to continue and to snowball as it has with Ryland Homes. I'd like to ask Tom Harron, is it not true that any rule that you make can be changed?

Harron: That is true, policies, general plan, and zoning can all be changed. The problem with Ryland relates to the problem Ivan was discussing before – what was happening was that we had the open space on someone's lot, the developer would grade it, and the buyer would think that it was an extension of their lot and begin to use it. Then, when the County comes in a few years later and tells them to tear down the amenities that have been built in that area, it is an ugly case – there is an expectation based upon how the property looks. Now, if at the beginning, the subdivision is designed to ensure the graded areas doesn't encroach into that open space, and if you put some barriers (landscaping, rock walls, etc) that show where the limit of their property is and where the open space starts, then people understand that the area is not theirs and there are no built up expectations. It makes it a much easier enforcement issue. When you have a design feature then it looks like, if they use it, they are trespassing.

Mitchell: That seems to be the practice though – developers go into a site and render it sterile. Then we have to go from there.

Woods: I believe that part of the intent here is to create (at the beginning) some of these tools, so that this doesn't happen. And that is what you will begin to work on at 10 o'clock.

Jones: I have three points to make. First, we've all seen that code enforcement doesn't work... they are under staffed and we need an alternative. Second, another problem we run up against is the fact that grading permits come out of DPW, the design and zoning comes out of DPLU, and they don't talk to each other. So the result is that grading goes in, and then planning comes in after it. My main concern, however, is not with the required open space, but with the remainder parcel.

Citrano: We are going to talk about that next.

Jones: I'm very concerned about that, because according to what the IG is proposing, one of the uses allowed is future development. So, when we are looking at these examples today, I don't see any examples of that future development in the remainder parcel.

Citrano: The remainder parcel. If you use the minimum lot size, or less than the maximum, you will end up with a remainder. Remember, this is the IG proposal, not yours. Now, here is what can happen with the remainder: 1) You can vary

your lot size, 2) You can use it for additional infrastructure, 3) You can use it for recreational opportunities – in the IG proposal, they did not allow any active recreation in the open space. If you have a remainder parcel, you might be able to accommodate equestrian facilities, parks, ball fields, etc. 4) A land bank – because the IG was so concerned with protecting the rural lands. Now, this would apply after 2020 and would require a GPA. But, under this proposal, if one were to get a GPA then they could potentially add more lots. They identified that they would rather see future development in the semi-rural areas in order to continue to preserve the rural areas.

Now, this committee will get a chance to do your own proposal.

One last thing: density incentives. The IG was more concerned with minimizing the development footprint than they were with the number of lots that they allow. So if an open space subdivision meets the standards, then they would allow a developer to build at full yield (without yield reductions for slope). But, you are going to get a chance to meet in your groups and do your own proposal.

Hammers: We've already gone on record saying that the RPO is not applicable with RL-40 and up. One of the questions that have come up in our community is really thorny (and I haven't heard anyone who can give me a straight answer on this) ... if these required open spaces go into these conservancies, , what keeps them from developing 40 years into the future?

Harron: Well, it's a deed restriction. The person who dedicates it normally dedicates an easement for a specific purpose. You don't have any greater right than what was given to you in that limited easement.

Woods: If a deed restriction is a tool of how you craft it and who holds it [the open space].

Hammers: ... but there is nothing in there about deed restrictions

Harron: If you grant a fee to a conservancy, they can do what they want with that property. If you grant an easement for open space or for biological mitigation, then at is all that ...

??: ... if property is turned loose to these conservancies, where are these restrictions?

Harron: We are going to be drafting policies that deal with subdivisions. If what we say is we want an easement for biological or mitigation purposes then they [developer] is not going to get a subdivision approved unless that's what is done. You're going to be able to give advice on controls that will apply to all future development.

Hammers: What I see with these people doing the subdividing is that they think, "ok, I understand I'm only going to end up with 40% of my property, here is the 60%..." They then write it off and are not concerned with what deed restrictions are in that 60% that they loose. That becomes part of the price of the subdivision. The developer doesn't care.

- Harron:** Yes, but you do, and we do... and you are the ones that are going to advise the County on what we are going to require to approve that subdivision ... if you say you want you want that to be an easement, not a fee because a fee can be used for other purposes, then that is what the County will include in its policy.
- Woods:** Don't worry about past sins; we're starting with a clean slate from now forward. We want to correct the mistakes from the past – what examples you've seen in your communities. We want to tie the noose a little tighter, and Tom [Harron] has the tools to do that, and we are going to have that as part of the application for subdivision.
- Citrano:** Ok...we're about at 10 o'clock and I just want to get through one more slide. The final issue we are going to cover is mandatory versus voluntary under the IG proposal. The IG were more concerned with protecting rural lands than semi-rural and therefore made Conservation Subdivisions mandatory in categories SR-10 and lower, and voluntary in semi-rural areas. That way, if you have an established semi-rural neighborhood, you are not forced to go to a minimum lot size ... you could keep the same character. However, you do have the opportunity in those areas. The other aspect is bringing in the density incentives would encourage developers to want to do a Conservation Subdivision in the semi-rural areas because they would be able to get full yield of their lots. This is one of the reasons they made it mandatory in rural areas – because there is no opportunity for density incentives in those areas.
- So that is the presentation.
- Woods:** Two more questions/comments from the table: Joe and Jack... and after their questions we are going to take a 10 minute break and then break into groups.
- Chisholm:** Under the IG proposal, the remainder parcels, are they subject to environmental review for the entire parcel? ...
- Carmichael:** The open space is actually a minimum open space. If one needed it for biological preservation, you wouldn't have included it in the remainder area.
- Phillips:** A couple of comments on the remainder parcel issue. What density would you assign to it?
- Holler:** Today? ... today, once you build to the density allowed by the plan, the remainder parcel gets zero. It takes a future plan update or plan amendment to allow density in that area.
- Phillips:** But it would be like the future urban development area? It would be like we are saying, "This is land that can be developed 15 years from now."
- Holler:** Jack, you are correct, but it would require a GPA or an overall update.
- Phillips:** I want to point out that you say it can be between 16 and 32% of the developed parcel. In the suburban areas and in the semi-rural areas this can be a very significant hunk of land ... and certainly the developer will be very anxious to throw in houses on 5,000 sq. ft. lots and leave the largest remainder parcel he

could. Then we are not looking at a General Plan ... there is no way you can analyze the traffic and infrastructure affects of a plan where up to 62% of a parcel can be called remainder and not define the density. I can assure you that the 5,000 sq. ft. lots will define the density.

Holler: Jack, I have to disagree with you in one sense ... we did define the density. As I indicated, the density on the remainder parcel would be zero. Therefore, in our traffic analysis, when we are reviewing our EIR for the general plan, we can calculate that.

Phillips: I understand, but what I am trying to convey to you is that CEQA requires you to consider the total impact of a project, and when you say there is a remainder, you can't say there is a remainder intended for future development without defining the limitations on that future development. It defies logic to say in 15 years we are going to have this back of property throughout the County that have a right to build more intense development than what is allowed on the rest of the property. Especially when we are talking about going from 1du/2-acres down to 5,000 sq. ft. lots ... we are talking about the ability to make significant changes in our infrastructure requires, in our community character, etc. I think it is a real CEQA problem because it is a failure to disclose the entire project.

Citrano: Yes, but Jack that is just the IG proposal. You will now have a chance to get into groups and craft your own proposal.

Phillips: I know you keep saying that, but...

Holler: I'd like to ask Tom [Harron] to respond to the CEQA issue.

Harron: It's the same non-problem you have with a general plan amendment. In the future, we can have 10 more general plan amendments. We don't have to do CEQA on every single GPA that can happen in the future. We just have to do CEQA on what our proposal is today. And our proposal today would be that the remainder parcel has zero density. That is the environmental effect that we have to consider.

Phillips: But that is not what these developers are using it for. That is not the intent of assigning the remainder parcel. I submit that you are kidding the entire system by having the remainder parcel there and saying, "well its going to be zero, so you don't have to worry about it in the future."

Committee Member: But that is why we are going to break into groups, Jack, so that we can make those points.

Holler: Yes, and I think your position is clear...we've answered from a legal standpoint, and we feel confident with that. However, what you choose to do with recommendations here might differ from this ... and that's ok.

Mitchell: Usually when we come down here, we come down to listen, it seems. And if community plans are supposed to be generated from the community then I think that maybe once in a while we ought to come down here to speak. We have had

one meeting (this one) since April...the special IG has had 16 or more...16 or more.

Holler: I don't know, but I don't think it has been 16.

Mitchell: They have two a month, do they not?

Carmichael: No. We have been canceling them left and right.

Mitchell: Well, you've been canceling ours too. They met several times ... they come up with a plan ... and we are herded down here to give our "ok".

Woods: No...

Mitchell: Wait...hear me out, please. The community plan is supposed to come from the community. So far, the public has had no input whatsoever on this. This has come from the special interest group ... and as I read through their minutes I see one big word there – yield. That is what they are looking for – yield. And under yield, there are two words – people (and they aren't included in it because we don't hear about it until the plan is put together) and the other is profit (looking for maximum yield). This is where the problem is. A community plan, if it comes out of this kind of action, is not a community plan...it is a special interest plan. We have to take this material and this plan and go back and give it sufficient coverage and input from the public in order for me (and maybe the rest of these people) to approve it. We don't even know enough about it yet because of all the questions that are coming out of this group. We can't say whether it is a good plan or it isn't a good plan. To me, it looks like the same thing with different words – as to what we discussed last time we sat here (we called it clustering then, now we have a fancy name for it, "conservation subdivision"). And maybe this is a way to disguise the plan or to make it sound better or maybe it is a different plan. But, I see the same thing in it that I've seen before. I, for one, what opportunity to take this back and give it to the people of Ramona, let the people of Ramona look at it and see what they think of it before I endorse that. I don't know what the rest of the members feel about their community, but that is my opinion. Thank you.

Jemmot: Couple questions. On the definition of utilities...a lot of properties have access roads to parcels behind them. Would that be considered a "utility"?

Citrano: It would be part of the development footprint.

Jemmot: So if there is already an access road granted to a different parcel, unrelated to the development on the parcel, it would be considered part of the development footprint?

Citrano: Yes.

Jemmot: I couldn't be considered part of the required open space?

Citrano: Its already disturbed.

Jemmot: Ok...power lines?

Holler: Power lines could probably go into the open space under the utility provision under the IG proposal. When you discuss this with your group and decide the group would rather not have something or would like to have something else in there, that is fine. I would encourage you to make your own proposal.

Carmichael: But they [IG] haven't further defined it.

Jemmot: Ok, because co-generation, major utilities, etc ... those are all utilities...

Holler: They [IG] don't get into that, but if you want to get to that level of detail, that's fine.

Jemmot: Well it makes a big difference as to where open space requirements are. Next question... I was wondering if traffic analysis has been done and where that analysis now stands. Is that being done with consideration to the "bonus" use of getting rid of the steep slope requirements?

Holler: When we ran our traffic model, we have not turned the yield reductions off.

Jones: Just a quick question. CEQA requires the general plan to be updated every 20 years...

Holler: Well, its not quite that defines, but 20 years is generally the length.

Rowan: Ten years is really the recommended time frame — after that the jurisdiction is put on a list by the State Attorney General.

Harron: And its not CEQA...its just a guideline from the State.

Jones: So the zero density remainder parcel has the potential to change in 10 years?

Rowan: It depends on how frequently the jurisdiction updates its general plan.

Jones: So we are looking at 2020?

Rowan: Yes, and the last time the jurisdiction updated its plan was in the '70s.

Jones: And, as I recall, Gary [Pryor] had said that it was overdue.

Rowan: Based on State Guidelines is it.

Hammers: Just to address Jack's point... I'm not too concerned with the remainder parcel because once the developer is out of the picture, then he is not going to be doing anything anymore – it will be the individual property owners. And it is so expensive for the individual property owners to do something like that, that there will not be very many of them [additional developments in the remainder parcels]. Well, I suppose it depends on how it is written up.

Woods: I'm going to take one more question, and then we are going to break.

Montgomery: My question centers around the fact that this is based on the Randal Arendt concept. In his video, the whole goal behind these kinds of developments was to create networks of open space — and that is the one thing missing in this proposal – the big picture.

Holler: Well, again, we are only making a presentation on the IG specific proposals. The intent is to do exactly what you described. I think I alluded to that earlier to make sure that there is connectivity and to provide more valuable open space series rather than the more fragmented results that you see today. That is obviously our intent.

Montgomery: Isn't that kind of important to get into the final draft? One of the things we talked about last time was that each community would be identifying those areas that it felt needed to be saved. So, now that we are talking about percentages, it seems that we are concentrating on rural lands, when there might be some beautiful natural systems in the semi-rural lands needing to be preserved. It might be mandatory to preserve those systems, rather than developers choosing what they want. It seems to me that one of the keys to making this work is having the areas of particular value be identified by the communities...because without that, what is the point.

BREAK: 10 MINUTES

WORKSHOP — STEERING COMMITTEE WAS BROKEN DOWN INTO THREE GROUPS: NORTH COUNTY, EAST COUNTY, AND BACK COUNTRY

Woods: I think that this was a very good idea with productive discussions. Do you like what you did in the groups today? Do you like the discussions in the groups? Because I would like to propose that we do it again. Ivan said that he will be able to compile all your comments by Thursday of this week (group by group) and then mail them out to you so that they are available to you for discussions with your planning groups. We will then get back together for additional discussions in 4-6 weeks. We will call and set a date, based on how far you get with your communities. Every comment from every group will be shared with the entire committee.

Holler: Now, we plan to meet again in 4-6 weeks ... for those of you wanting to take this back to your groups, is that an adequate amount of time?

Jones: Please don't make the meeting on March 6th.

Holler: Well get together all of these comments and have them in the mail to you by Thursday so that you can, hopefully, have them by the weekend. Then we can come back together and discuss this further.

Hammers: Can me do this in the first part of April so that we have adequate time to distribute this information out?

Holler: What is the pleasure of the group? 6 weeks takes us to about the middle of March.

Woods: Why don't we let coordination take place through the lead planners?

Holler: If we can get to this in 6 weeks, I'd rather do that.

Community Member: Is there a possibility of having DPLU personnel come up and walk the groups through this?

Holler: Unfortunately, I don't have time to do that. There is no way that I have the resources available in that timeframe. I can try to accommodate some of them, but ...

Morgan: What is the next deadline for the Board?

Holler: We don't have a set date. The Board directed us to conduct traffic modeling on a number of different land use scenarios that the Board identified. We just have the traffic results back from SANDAG and we are still analyzing them. My desire is to move on with this project, so I'd like to get down there.

Phillips: At the Board, they directed DPLU staff to come back with maps on 8 or 9 scenarios. Where does all that stand?

Holler: Well that is what I was just describing. What they actually directed us to do was to conduct traffic models on different land use distributions. What we'll be doing is coming back to the Board with the results of that and also staff will make a recommendation on a preferred project – now the basis of that will be on the information that came out of the traffic. We are still analyzing the traffic results.

Jemmot: I'd like to thank staff for their patients with us...we're not easy to deal with.

Woods: Anyway, I think this was a great discussion and I look forward to having more of these in the future – I think it's a great tool.

Galavinic: I would make one request...when you do have a map, can you get it to us as quickly as possible for community review?

Holler: Absolutely.

End Meeting – 12:00 pm